UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,026	12/04/2001	Chee Hung Ben Choi	16675/94636-00	9518

33222	7590	03/06/2006	

JONES, WALKER, WAECHTER, POITEVENT, CARRERE
& DENEGRE, L.L.P.
5TH FLOOR, FOUR UNITED PLAZA
8555 UNITED PLAZA BOULEVARD
BATON ROUGE, LA 70809

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33 and 35-39* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-19,21-33 and 35-39* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3 and 20* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 1/17/06.

2. Claims 1-33 and 35-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, 18 and 35 are independent claims. Claims 1, 17, 18 and 35 have been amended; claim 34 has been cancelled; and claims 36-39 have been added.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 18, 19, 21, 22, 36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimomura et al. ("Shimomura").

As per claim 1, Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized directory of computer files/individualized listing of links comprising:

a. prearranging computer files to form a global default directory (section [0108];

in accordance with lines 5-6 of page 7 of the specification, the global directory is an

organized collection of individual Web pages which form the Internet).

b. maintaining user customization data in a user customization data file (figs. 7-8;

sections [0099]-[0104]; *user customization data file or user preference file 757*); and

c. automatically, without user intervention, reconfiguring a copy of a portion of the

global default directory based on the user customization data file, thereby creating an

individualized view of a user directory (fig. 8; *displayed is the reconfigured/modified*

copy of a portion of the global default directory/organized collection of individual Web

pages, which form the Internet, based on user customization data file or user preference

file).

As per claim 2, Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized

directory/individualized listing of links wherein the global default directory includes files

in the Internet and/or an Intranet (section [0108]; *global default directory/organized*

collection of individual Web pages, which form the Internet).

As per claim 4, Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized

directory/individualized listing of links comprising allowing multiple client computers to

access the global default directory on a server computer (fig. 4; sections [0099]-[0104]

and [0108]).

As per claim 5, Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized

directory/individualized listing of links comprising storing user customization data in a

user computer ([0098]; *a user at a client system creates user customization data/user*

set of preferences wherein the customization data is inherently temporarily or

permanently stored in the client system used given that the user customization data has

to be presented and collected in order to create it).

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

As per claim 36, Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized

directory/individualized listing of links wherein the global default directory is a global

Internet directory (sections [0099]-[0104] and [0108]).

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 36 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   Claims 6-8 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Shimomura et al. ("Shimomura") in view of Screen Dumps of Netscape 4.75

("Netscape").

As per claim 6, although Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising providing a user interface for a user to view files in said user directory (fig. 8), Shimomura does not explicitly disclose modifying files in said user directory. Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising providing a user interface for a user to modify files in said user directory (Netscape: figs. 2-4). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Netscape with the method of Shimomura in order to allow users to make minor adjustment$\overset{\varsigma}{\underset{\wedge}{\text{that}}}$ are temporary.

As per claim 7, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized directory/individualized listing of links wherein said modification of files in said user directory is at least one of opening, cutting, copying, pasting, deleting, or renaming (Netscape: fig. 4, *elements 420 and 430*).

As per claim 8, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising updating said user customization data based on the arrangements or modifications by a user (Netscape: fig. 5).

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 7 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 8 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

7.   Claims 9-17, 22, 26-33, 35, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Shimomura et al. ("Shimomura") in view of Salas et al.

("Salas").

As per claim 9, although Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising collecting user

customization data ([0098]; *user customization data/user set of preferences are*

collected through forms presented by server 781), Shimomura does not teach collecting

user customization data from multiple users in order to form a global usage history.

Salas teaches user customization data from multiple users in order to form a global

usage history (Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19). It would

have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of

KK   Salas with the method of Shimomura in order to provide sharing and communication of

data between users.

As per claim 10, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising sending each user

request of a file or folder modification from a client computer to a server computer

(Salas: col. 12, lines 31-61).

As per claim 11, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising updating said global

usage history based on subsequent user requests to modify or arrange files or folders

(Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19; col. 12, lines 31-61).

As per claim 12, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising recording a particular

directory modification specified by a user request and the number of requests specifying

a particular modification (Salas: col. 14, lines 25-55).

As per claim 13, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising storing said global

usage history in a database (Salas: fig. 1; *database 20 and 20' with respective portions*

of the specification).

As per claim 14, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising updating said global

default directory based on the global usage history (Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5,

line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19; col. 12, lines 31-61).

As per claim 15, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising adding, removing, or

renaming files or folders in the global default directory based on said global usage

history (Netscape: figs 2-4; Salas: col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-

19).

As per claim 16, the modified Shimomura teaches a method for creating an

individualized directory/individualized listing of links comprising modifying attributes of

files or folders in the global default directory based on said global usage history (Salas:

col. 4, line 56 through col. 5, line 4; col. 5, lines 11-19).

Claim 17 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 11 and 14 and is

therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 10 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 29 is similar in scope to claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 13 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 14 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 32 is similar in scope to claim 15 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 16 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale

except for the feature of automatically retrieving the user customization data, which the

modified Shimomura also teaches (Salas: col. 11, lines 25-30; col. 16, lines 21-43).

As per claim 37, Shimomura teaches a method for creating an individualized

directory/individualized listing of links wherein the global default directory is a global

Internet directory (sections [0099]-[0104] and [0108]).

Claim 39 is similar in scope to claim 36 and is therefore rejected under similar

rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter and Reasons for Allowance

8.   Claims 3 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

9.   The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art made of record fails to anticipate or make obvious the claimed

invention. Specifically, the prior art fails to teach, in combination with the remaining

elements:

the method comprising <u>adding files into or removing files from *said* global default</u>

<u>directory</u> as recited in claims 3 and 20 with the remaining elements of <u>creating an</u>

<u>individualized directory of computer files comprising prearranging computer files to form</u>

<u>a global default directory, maintaining user customization data in a user customization</u>

<u>data file and automatically, without user intervention, *reconfiguring a copy of a portion* of</u>

the global default directory based on the user customization data file, thereby creating

an individualized view of a user directory as recited in claims 1 and 18.

Although Shimomura et al., Screen Dumps of Netscape 4.75 and Salas et al.

teach a substantial amount of the claimed matters, Shimomura et al., Screen Dumps of

Netscape 4.75 and Salas et al. fail to anticipate or render the above underlined

limitations obvious. Moreover, although the references have elements of the

independent claims, they do not provide for a suggestion to modify and make the above

underlined limitations of claims 3 and 20 obvious.

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 and 35-39 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

MacNaughton et al. (US 6,020,884) teach Community bookmarks enable

community members to contribute Web pages for the benefit of other community

members.

Dempski et al. (US 6,727,927 B1) teach a system, method and article of

manufacture for a user interface for a knowledge management tool.

Dando (US 6,944,829 B2) teaches configurable UI component management

system.

Lord et al. (US 6,961,909 B2) teach a system for displaying a hierarchical

directory.

Odom (US 6,606,102 B1) teaches a process wherein user profiles are obtained

by discerning and collating user interest based upon patterns of search and selection of

displayed content.

Muschetto (US 6,850,255 B2) teaches a method and apparatus for accessing

information, computer programs and electronic communications across multiple

computing devices using a GUI.

Hekmatpour (US 5,799,292) teaches adaptive hypermedia presentation method

and system.

Inquires

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571)**

272-4068. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to

3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (571) 272-4063.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LVN
Patent Examiner
February 3, 2006

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100